# TTWG COMMITTEE MEETING OCTOBER 16,2002

ATTENDING: Donna Phillips, Dave Christianson, Wendy Hawley, Liza Fox, Nathan Bentley, Dave Gruenhagen, Bob Smith, Tracey Fuller, Mike Ciscell, Dirk Roeller, Larry Brotman, Byron Keely

#### WENDY'S PRESENTATION: (her notes are attached to the end of this document)

- Washington's transportation group was created prior to the push for an I-plan
- Their 1st start was unsuccessful due to lack of funding, no clear vision/purpose or fulltime staff
- Their 2<sup>nd</sup> attempt has solved some of their problems
- The groups structure is made up of one fulltime position, a steering committee (15 people) and a partners group (unlimited # of people) open to all people wishing to have input.
- The group has decided to use the business needs of the transportation community as a base for their plan
- These business needs will be rated based on currently available data, available technology, funding, and the number of users that share that need in order to determine the implementation priority
- They feel their historical documentation was too technical which caused communication issues. Future documentation should be less technical.

## ROLE OF THE TTWG & CONTENT OF I PLAN:

In this portion of our meeting there was a lot of very good dialog a few of the highlights were:

- At this time of the TTWG appears to have two roles. First to write the transportation portion of the I-plan so we can attempt to get Federal funding and second develop a viable data model to support data sharing and the implementation of any current or additional funding.
- Who is the audience? State, Local, Federal, Tribal, and Private Sector.
- As a goal the TTWG portion of the I-plan should be completed by the end of the year. For an initial framework the Utah plan will be used.
- Given the short amount of time we have to create the initial plan, we feel that this draft will have to be written without thoroughly detailing each section. More importantly we need to lay a good foundation with the understanding that this document will need to be modified periodically.
- Similar to Washington, getting a good idea of the stakeholders and business needs is a good place to start. Several of the State agencies have already identified their needs and offered to share them with the group.
- Maintenance needs to be a part of the initial plan. Prior to the creating of datasets a good viable maintenance program should be created to ensure success.
- Nontraditional transportation data users such as Dept. of Education, Dept. of Agriculture, etc. should be considered when we are writing the plan.
- The plan we write should be written so both technical and non-technical people can understand.

# FOR NEXT MEETING

#### Homework:

- 1. Please, **PRIOR** to the next meeting, e-mail to the group, a list of who you feel the stakeholders are in Idaho's Transportation data and what their business needs are.
- 2. Dave and Donna will work on an I-plan skeletal framework for review and red-lining. This document should be distributed to the group by October 23. Please review and make comments to the group regarding this document.

Next Meeting October 30, 2002 8:30 PST/9:30 Boise Time

# **Presentation Notes from Wendy Hawley**

# HISTORY in a nutshell

Started – 1998/1999 Stopped – mid 2000 Started up again – mid 2002

# Why'd this happen (very general summary):

1<sup>st</sup> Start – OMB initiative and push for statewide I-Teams

## Stop -

- lack of clear vision/purpose;
- part-time organizers;
- no-one willing to fund implementation

# 2<sup>nd</sup> Start -

- renewed push for statewide Implementation plans (more attention from Executive Branch of gov't after September 11<sup>th</sup>);
- WSDOT mgmt realize the value and willing to fund a full-time project manager

#### What Changed:

For the most part the vision, goals, and objectives have not changed.

It is THE PLAYERS and THE APPROACH that has changed.

Best way to describe this is to just go over the changes that took place and are taking place:

## **PLAYERS**

- Part-time "chairperson" to a Full time "project manager"
  - 1. background in project mgmt and IT; not GIS so focus is on starting and completing a project
  - 2. time commitment is available (doesn't have to "make" time)
  - 3. Understands risk assessment and management; business requirements elicitation, documentation and management; change management; work process schedule and budget management; communications management; and issue management
  - 4. Keeps people informed and on schedule
  - 5. Regularly scheduled meetings well in advance with "deliverables"

# • Gaining Partners

- 1. wider spread of partners across the state, levels of government, functions of government and private sector
  - (transportation, transit and transportation planning organizations; E-911 PSAPS, environmental concerns, forestry concerns and various private organizations including utilities)
- 2. tiers of commitment (steering committee {decision makers} vs. partners {buy-in and input})
- 3. Buy-in factor what's init for them; sales job

# **APPROACH**

- Reuse what was done already where possible
  - 1. Draft Charter
  - 2. Ken Dueker -- "White Paper on Issues and Strategies for Building a State Transportation Framework"

(Outlines some business drivers and requirements, design options, strategies and issues, possible pilot studies to use for assisting decision making)

• Clear and simple **communication** (not everyone is "technical")

- 1. Purpose Create an electronic map of transportation data for use in GIS apps across the state (work with other "state wide" layers, across different platforms)
- 2. Vision
- 3. Summary of Objectives
- 4. Scope
- What Order -- Data then project (needs) or Project (needs) then Data
  - 1. Phases Data Gathering; Data Stds; Define Pilots; Implement Statewide; maintenance
  - 2. Revisiting issues
  - 3. Defining/Prioritizing

Business Needs/requirements

Scope

Available data

Available technology

Funding

model

4. This was the area of MAJOR Redirection for this group